



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,638	12/15/2003	Philippe Rouanet	088734-1113	9056
22428 7590 11/12/2009 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
EXAMINER				
CLAYTOR, DEIRDRE RENEE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1627				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/12/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/734,638

**Applicant(s)**

ROUANET ET AL.

**Examiner**

Renee Claytor

**Art Unit**

1627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2009.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39 and 43-48 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 39, 43-48 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Currently, claims 39, 43-48 are pending and are under examination herein.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicants argue over the 35 USC 102(e) rejections over Bua and de Lignieres et al. In particular, Applicants have submitted a Declaration by the present inventors attesting that the invention was derived from them (the present inventors) and were not invented by Bua or de Lignieres.

It is noted that a 35 USC 102(e) rejection can be overcome by antedating the filing date of the reference by submitting an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 or by submitting an affidavit or declaration under 35 CFR 1.132 establishing that the relevant disclosure is applicant's own work (see MPEP § 2136.05). The discussion in the MPEP raises that the issue turns on what the evidence of record shows as to who invented the subject matter. A showing can be made by proving that the inventors of the U.S. patent application publication were associated with applicant and learned of applicant's invention from applicant. Though a declaration was filed by the present inventors, there is no indication that just because the inventors the present application and the inventions of Bua and de Lignieres worked for the same company that the invention stemmed from the present inventors.

Applicants have filed terminal disclaimers over co-pending applications 10/734,644, 10/805,528 and 10/734,640; therefore, the double patenting rejections over these applications are withdrawn. Applicants have not argued over the double patenting rejections over co-pending application 11/009,390 and 11/249,122 because if

this is the only issue remaining in the application, it is noted that this is the earlier filed application and the rejection will be withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 39, 43-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bua (US Pg/Pub 2004/0138314).

Bua teaches compositions for percutaneous administration that comprise 4-hydroxy tamoxifen as the sole active agent, isopropyl myristate, ethyl alcohol, hydroxypropylcellulose and a phosphate buffer. Table 1 outlines this composition and gives amounts that fall within that of the presently claimed invention, in particular 4-hydroxytamoxifen is present at 0.02 g, ethyl alcohol is present at 72 g, isopropyl myristate is present at 1 g, hydroxypropylcellulose 1.5 g and the rest phosphate buffer. This composition falls within the percentage ranges currently claimed in claims 39, 43-47. Bua teaches that the 4-hydroxytamoxifen is packaged in a dose-meter pump, meeting the limitation of claim 48.

Claims 39 and 43-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by de Lignieres et al. (US Pg/Pub 2005/0032909).

De Lignieres et al. teach compositions for percutaneous administration that comprise 4-hydroxy tamoxifen as the sole active agent, isopropyl myristate, ethyl alcohol, hydroxypropylcellulose and a phosphate buffer. Table 1 outlines this composition and gives amounts that fall within that of the presently claimed invention, in particular 4-hydroxytamoxifen is present at 0.02 g, ethyl alcohol is present at 72 g, isopropyl myristate is present at 1 g, hydroxypropylcellulose 1.5 g and the rest phosphate buffer. This composition falls within the percentage ranges currently claimed in claims 39, 43-47. Bua teaches that the 4-hydroxytamoxifen is packaged in a dose-meter pump (paragraph 0047), meeting the limitation of claim 48.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thornton*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 39, 43-48 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4-13, 15-23 of copending Application No. 11/009,390. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims are drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprised of 4-hydroxy tamoxifen, isopropyl myristate, alcohol, an aqueous vehicle and a gelling agent in particular amounts. The claims of Application 11/009,390 are drawn to a method of treating a male patient comprising percutaneous administration of 4-hydroxy tamoxifen, isopropyl myristate, ethyl alcohol and hydroxymethylcellulose in amounts that overlap with those presently claimed. As there was no restriction between this particular claimed method and the composition in the present application, a double-patenting rejection is warranted.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 39 and 43-48 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7, 10-11 of copending Application No. 11/249,122. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims are drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprised of 4-hydroxy tamoxifen, isopropyl myristate, alcohol, an aqueous vehicle and a gelling agent in particular amounts. The claims of Application 11/249,122 are also drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising 4-

hydroxy tamoxifen, isopropyl myristate, alcohol, an aqueous vehicle and a gelling agent in amounts that differ but overlap with that of the present invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Renee Claytor whose telephone number is (571)272-8394. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Renee Claytor

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1627